<u>REMARKS</u>

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action initially dated March 15, 2010. Claims 1, 5, 6, 11 and 15 remain in the application. Claims 1, 5, 11 and 15 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,025,837 (Mathews) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,930,730 (Maxon), and Claims 5, 6 and 15 were rejected under § 103(a) over Mathews. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Referring specifically to the claims, Claim 1 is directed to an information processing apparatus, comprising a first receiving unit constructed to receive digital data described in a markup language and including a first hierarchical level element delimited by a predetermined tag, second hierarchical level elements which belong to a lower hierarchical level than the first hierarchical level, and third hierarchical level elements which belong to a lower hierarchical level than the second hierarchical level, a display unit constructed to display the first, second and third hierarchical level elements included in the received digital data on a same display screen, a second receiving unit constructed to receive, from a remote controller, key-input first, second or third signals, and a switching unit constructed to switch a selection of an element between the second hierarchical level elements when the first signal is received by the second receiving unit in a case where the second hierarchical level element is selected, switch a selection of an element from the second hierarchical level element to the first hierarchical level element when the second signal is received by the second receiving unit in a case where the second hierarchical level

- 7 -

element is selected, and switch a selection of an element from the second hierarchical level element to the third hierarchical level element when the third signal is received by the second receiving unit in a case where the second hierarchical level element is selected.

Claim 11 is a method claim that substantially corresponds to Claim 1.

It is noted that the first level element can be seen to correspond to 56 in Fig. 4, the second level elements can be seen to correspond to 57, 61 and 65 in Fig. 4, and the third level elements can be seen to correspond to 58-60, 62-64 and 66-68 in Fig. 4, and the switching unit is supported by Figs. 10, 11 and 14.

The applied art, alone or on any permissible combination, is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of Claims 1 and 11, and in particular, is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the features of a switching unit constructed to switch a selection of an element between the second hierarchical level elements when the first signal is received by the second receiving unit in a case where the second hierarchical level element is selected, switch a selection of an element from the second hierarchical level element to the first hierarchical level element when the second signal is received by the second receiving unit in a case where the second hierarchical level element is selected, and switch a selection of an element from the second hierarchical level element to the third hierarchical level element when the third signal is received by the second receiving unit in a case where the second hierarchical level element is selected.

Mathews is seen to teach an interactive entertainment system that incorporates an electronic programming guide. A user can drag and drop a hyperlink from the EPG onto a hyperlink browser UI of the system and when the user activates the hyperlink in the EPG, the UI launches the browser to activate the target resource of the

hyperlink. Mathews also discloses that focus frame 126 overlaid on a predetermined element can be moved up or down, or left or right. Thus, the focus frame is moved to the same hierarchical level elements arranged in the upper side or downside of the predetermined element, or the right side or left side of the predetermined element. Mathews is not, however, seen to disclose or to suggest at least the features of a switching unit constructed to switch a selection of an element between the second hierarchical level elements when the first signal is received by the second receiving unit in a case where the second hierarchical level element is selected, switch a selection of an element from the second hierarchical level element to the first hierarchical level element when the second signal is received by the second receiving unit in a case where the second hierarchical level element is selected, and switch a selection of an element from the second hierarchical level element to the third hierarchical level element when the third signal is received by the second receiving unit in a case where the second hierarchical level element is selected.

Maxon is merely seen to disclose highlighting a selected element and non-selected element in the same level where they are highlighted in a distinguishable manner. However, Maxon is not seen to teach anything that, when combined with Mathews, would have resulted in the features of a switching unit constructed to switch a selection of an element between the second hierarchical level elements when the first signal is received by the second receiving unit in a case where the second hierarchical level element is selected, switch a selection of an element from the second hierarchical level element to the first hierarchical level element when the second signal is received by the second receiving unit in a case where the second hierarchical level element is selected, and switch a selection of an element from the second hierarchical level element to the third hierarchical level

element when the third signal is received by the second receiving unit in a case where the second hierarchical level element is selected.

In view of the foregoing, independent Claims 1 and 11, as well as the claims dependent therefrom, are believed to be allowable.

In another aspect, the invention of Claim 5 is directed to an information processing apparatus, comprising a first receiving unit constructed to receive digital data described in a markup language and including a plurality of elements delimited by predetermined tags, a display unit constructed to display the plurality of elements included in the received digital data on a same display screen based on a predetermined layout described in the markup language, an identifying unit constructed to identify an information amount contained in each of said plurality of elements, wherein the information amount contained in each element is at least one of an area size in which the element is displayed, the number of characters contained in the element, and the number of bytes of data contained in the element, a second receiving unit constructed to receive a predetermined signal input in turn by an arrow key operation from a remote controller, and a switching unit constructed to, when the predetermined signal is received by the second receiving unit, switch a selection of an element between said plurality of displayed elements in turn according to the information amount contained in each element identified by said identifying unit.

Claim 15 is a method claim that substantially corresponds to Claim 5.

The applied art of Mathews is not seen to teach the features of Claims 5 and 15, and in particular, is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the features of a switching unit constructed to, when the predetermined signal is received by the second receiving unit,

switch a selection of an element between said plurality of displayed elements in turn according to the information amount contained in each element identified by said identifying unit.

As discussed above, Mathews teaches that the focus frame is moved up, down, left or right in the same level. However, Mathews is not seen to teach at least the features of a switching unit constructed to, when the predetermined signal is received by the second receiving unit, switch a selection of an element between said plurality of displayed elements in turn according to the information amount contained in each element identified by said identifying unit.

In view of the foregoing, Claims 5 and 15, as well as the claims dependent therefrom, are believed to be allowable.

No other matters having been raised, the entire application is believe to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

- 12 -

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Edward Kmett/

_____

Edward A. Kmett
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 5078999v1

- 12 -